

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-19 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-14, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Maes (US Patent No. 6,016,476).

Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes.

Claims 3-7, 10-13 and 16-19 are cancelled herein without disclaimer or prejudice.

Therefore, claims 1-2, 8-9, and 14-15 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The foregoing rejections are hereby traversed.

DRAWINGS

Please replace FIGS. 4 and 7 with the attached two (2) Replacement Sheets of drawings for FIGS. 4 and 7, correcting minor typographical errors as indicated in the attached Annotated Sheets Showing Changes.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Independent claims 1, 8, and 14 are amended for clarity by tying the claim elements together. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 10, line 22 to page 11, line 31.

The examiner cited the step 100 in Fig. 4 in Maes to indicate receiving an item of personal information necessary for a member registration from a computer of a product or service provider if performing the member registration. However, the step 100 in Fig. 4 in Maes is a step of establishing a communication link with the central server 60 of the service provider to obtain the digital certificate. See column 7, lines 57 to 59. Therefore, there are no direct description and suggestion for receiving an item of personal information necessary for a member registration from a computer of a product or service provider. In addition, the item of personal information as claimed in independent claims 1, 8 and 14, differs from the “digital

certificate” of Maes, because the digital certificate is binary encrypted file containing information relating to the account number of the PDA device 10, the date on which the digital certificate was authenticated and its expiration date. See column 7, lines 42 to 49. The digital certificate of Maes is unnecessary for the member registration in Maes, because in Maes the enrollment is carried out prior to the issuance of the digital certificate. See column 7, lines 20 to 25. In contrast to Maes, the present claimed invention provides, “receiving an item of ***personal information necessary for a member registration*** from a computer of a product or service provider ***if performing the member registration***” (e.g., claim 1, emphasis added).

In addition, the examiner cited column 3, lines 16 to 37 to indicate extracting, from a storage device storing personal information for a customer in advance, personal information for the customer, which corresponds to said item of personal information received from said computer of said product or service provider, and for transmitting the extracted personal information to said computer of said product or service provider. The portion the examiner cited indicates only “a memory” for storing financial and personal information of the user. However, there are no description and suggestion for the present claimed invention’s, “extracting, from a storage device storing personal information for a customer in advance, ***personal information for the customer, which corresponds to said item of said personal information received from said computer of said product or service provider, in response to receiving said item of said personal information necessary for the member registration***, and for transmitting the extracted personal information to said computer of said product or service provider” (e.g., claim 1, emphasis added).

Furthermore, the examiner cited the step 116 in Fig. 4 in Maes to indicate receiving, from said computer of said product or service provider, member identification information and storing said member identification information in the storage device. At the step 116 in Fig. 4, the digital certificate is downloaded. However, because the enrollment is carried out prior the issuance of the digital certificate in Maes (see column 7, lines 20 to 25), and, thus, in Maes the steps 100 to 116 are carried out without any direct relationship with the enrollment in Maes, the digital certificate is not received ***as a result of the member registration***. That is, the portion of Maes the examiner relies upon does not disclose or suggest the present claimed invention’s, “receiving, from said computer of said product or service provider, ***member identification information as a result of the member registration***, and for storing said member identification information in the storage device storing the personal information for the customer in advance” (e.g., claim 1, emphasis added).

Therefore, independent claims 1, 8 and 14 are not anticipated by Meas, because Maes does not disclose or suggest every claim element of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 14.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Dependent claims 2, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes. Dependent claims 2, 9 and 15 are amended for clarity by tying the claim elements together. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 6, lines 12 to 20, and page 9, lines 9 to 23.

The examiner states the “virtual town” in the present claimed invention’s dependent claims 2, 9 and 15, corresponds to “the provider’s web site.” However, in the present claimed invention, the “virtual town” is unique to said customer, and the icons of the product or service providers, to which the customer has been registered as a member, are located in the virtual town. On the other hand, the provider’s web site is NOT unique to the customer and the icons of the product or service providers, to which the customer has been registered as a member, are NOT located in the provider’s web site. Therefore, Maes does not disclose or suggest the present claimed invention’s, “displaying, on a display device, an image wherein in which said icon **icons of said product or service provider providers, to which said customer has been registered as a member, is- are located in a virtual town of said customer**” (e.g., claim 1, emphasis added).

Therefore, the present claimed invention as recited in dependent claims 2, 9, and 15 is not obvious over Maes.


CONCLUSION

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of rejected pending claims is respectfully requested. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 19, 2004

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501